

Fax number: 1 571 273-8300

From: Allen Murray  
Fax number: 949-261-9664  
Business phone:  
Home phone:

Date & Time: 9/12/2008 11:35:02 AM  
Pages: 7  
Re: App. No. 10/501,577 Correction of App. No. and Filing Date

such as glycoconjugates, which are disclosed as cell wall precursors, can be analyzed (P8/L6-23) is simply not true. The glycoconjugates being discussed in Murray (P8/L6-23) are those extracted with cold water which are presumed to be cell wall precursors based on their appearance and disappearance with different stages of development. To assume that any glycoconjugate released by enzymatic or chemical means is also a cell wall precursor is an erroneous assumption. Clearly, any constituent released from the fiber by chemical or enzymatic means is by definition a "cell wall constituent" or a "cell wall component" but by no stretch of the imagination could it be called a cell wall precursor because it was released from an already formed cell wall. Further, Murray (P22/L20) **DOES NOT** discuss pH levels with respect to fiber degradation. The pH 5.0-5.2 mentioned in Murray (P22/L20) refers to the unbuffered pH of the reaction mixture with carbodiimide.

The above arguments are respectively submitted in the hope of clarifying a confusing response by the previous examiner. I hope this information is helpful to clarify the situation.

Respectfully submitted,

*Amurray*  
Irvine, CA 92614-6321  
amurray@glycozyme.com

5 Claims 1-10 should not be anticipated based on Murray (WO 99/35491)

prove that they are cellulose but rather that they are  $\beta$ -glucans. Although,

Murray (p25, l 17-18) states the "profiles indicates that the multimers are attached to protein" there is not proof of any covalent linkage presented.

Further, Murray (p25, l 24-26) only "suggests" that the linkage may extend the life of cotton fabrics.

With respect to Claim 4, Murray (P23/l 10-11) only states that fibers can be degraded using a cellulase followed by a protease but does not mention it in